

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,091	07/11/2003	Masahiko Sameshima	001273B	1945
23850 75	90 01/18/2006		EXAMINER	
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP			KUHNS, ALLAN R	
1725 K STREE SUITE 1000	T, NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON	N, DC 20006		1732	
				_

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<i>D</i>				
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/617,091	SAMESHIMA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Allan Kuhns	1732				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY IN THE MAILING	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Au	ugust 2006 and 10 November 20	<u>05</u> .				
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□							
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 2,3,8 and 9 is/are pending in the appli	cation.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>2,3,8 and 9</u> is/are rejected.						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce	epted or b) objected to by the i	Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	∋ 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
*****	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents		)-(d) or (f).				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	ity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau	, , , ,					
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
	•						
Attachmen	tie)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2)  Notic 3) Inform	the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>071103</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Application/Control Number: 10/617,091

Art Unit: 1732

1.Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 3 does not further limit claim 2 because this independent claim requires "a core mold and a cavity mold devoid of air orifices" while claim 3 recites the possibility that the orifices may only be "largely omitted".

Page 2

- 2.Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim is indefinite since "said passage orifices" lacks antecedent basis within the claims. Clarification is required.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4.Claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese reference (54-060366). The Japanese reference discloses or suggests the basic claimed in-mold foam molding method employing a foam molding apparatus having a core mold and a cavity mold and fixed partitioning members of comb-like configuration (note fig. 3) having a plurality of teeth for preventing the passage of starting materials, the teeth arranged along the mold parting direction,

Art Unit: 1732

wherein the method includes the steps of filling adjacent partitioned mold chambers partitioned by means of the fixed partitioning members with bead starting materials of different properties, and supplying steam to the mold cavity to heat and fuse the bead starting materials. Since the cited reference is silent concerning air orifices, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to omit them from the mold apparatus, as in claims 2 and 3, in order to simplify the construction of the apparatus.

The Japanese reference teaches or suggests using a first bead material incapable of passing through the teeth and a second bead material capable of passing through the teeth, as in claim 8, by disclosing (at page 5 of the translation) that a pin distance or spacing of 3 mm is used while expandable polystyrene with a particle diameter of as little as 2 mm may be used and polyethylene with a particle from 3.2-7 mm may be used. Different degrees of expansion, as in claim 9, are also taught by the Japanese reference since the polystyrene may be expanded 50 times while the polyethylene may be expanded 30 times.

5.Applicant's arguments filed October 26, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are considered to be moot by the examiner based on the revised grounds of rejection introduced in this Office action.

6.Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allan Kuhns whose telephone number is (571) 272-1202. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:00 to 5:30.

Application/Control Number: 10/617,091 Page 4

Art Unit: 1732

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on (571) 272-1196. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALLAN R. KUHNS PRIMARY EXAMINER AU 1732

1-12-06

allan R. Kulm